DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 283 911 UD 025 597

AUTHOR Haynes, Norris M.; And Others
TITLE School Development Program (Comer Process Implementation) in Prince Georges County, Milliken II Schools. Process Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Yale Univ., New Haven, Conn. Child Study Center.
PUB DATE Dec 86
NOTE 36p.; For related documents, see UD 025 596-599.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Change Strategies; Disadvantaged; Educational Environment; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; Evaluation Methods; *Parent Participation; Program Effectiveness; School Effectiveness; School Surveys
IDENTIFIERS Excellence in Education; *Prince Georges County Public Schools MD

ABSTRACT

This report presents results of a study of the effectiveness of the Comer Process, also known as the School Development Program (SDP) in the Milliken II Schools, Prince Georges County, Maryland. The process was introduced in the school system in summer 1985 to improve effectiveness of schools that could not be integrated because of their geographical isolation and whose student makeup was more than 90 percent black. The report describes study design, method, and analysis findings. The first section of analysis describes the implementation process, without critical review, based on consensus from interview responses and on documents. The second part analyzes responses to interview items and presents individuals' perceptions of various aspects of the process. Interviewees were district and school level staff, and parents. Generally the process was perceived as working well. It appeared to be achieving its goals to some extent. Some doubts were expressed on whether the process itself was bringing about the noted positive changes, whether it was interacting with other variables to produce change, or whether it was having any effect at all. Most respondents agreed that without the process the noted positive changes probably would not have occurred. The strongest effect of the process in schools seemed to be on teacher morale, followed by school climate. Student behavior and achievement are seen to have been positively affected as well, but to a lesser extent. Included is an appendix with lists of interview responses. (PS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED283911

5-21-87

PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

ON

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

(COMER PROCESS IMPLEMENTATION)

IN

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY

MILLIKEN II SCHOOLS

Norris M. Haynes, James P. Comer, Muriel Hamilton-Lee

James M. Boger, Edward Joyner

UD 025 597

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Yale University

Child Study Center

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Norris Haynes
Yale University

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements	
I Introduction	1
II Study Design	1
III Method	1
A. Sample	1
B. Instrument	2
C. Procedure	2
IV Analysis	3
A. Macro	3
1. History	3
2. Organizational Structure	4
3. Prince George's School System and SDP (Comer Process) Goals	5
4. Training in the SDP (Comer Process)	6
5. Dissemination of Information About SDP (Comer Process)	8
6. Implementation of the SDP (Comer Process) at the School Level	8
SDP Components	9
G&MT	9
SST	9
Social Calendar	10
B. Micro Analysis	
1. Central Office Level	11
(a) Goals	11
(b) Progress	11

2. School Level 12

(a) Goals 12

(b) Perceptions of Obstacles 12

(c) Principals' Perceptions of their Role 13

(d) Teachers/Counselors/Staff Perceptions of their Role 14

(e) Parents' Perception of their Role 15

(f) Special Activities and Events 16

(g) Perceptions of Functioning of Comer Process 17

(h) Training 17

(1) Representativeness of Trainees 17

(2) Perceived Usefulness of Training Activities 18

(3) Fulfillment of Expectations During Training 19

V. Summary 20

VI. Appendix 22

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Perceived Goals of SDP (Comer Process): Central Office Staff	23
2	Perceived Progress Toward Accomplishing Goals	24
3	Perceived Goals fo SDP (Comer Process): School Level	25
4	Perceived Obstacles	26
5	Perceived Effects of SDP (Comer Process)	27
6	Perception of Representativeness of Trainees	28
7	Perceived Usefulness of Training Activies	29
8	Perceived Fulfillment of Expectations During Training	30

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors of this report express their profound gratitude to the participants, including central and school level staff, as well as parents who kindly agreed to be interviewed.

Special gratitude is also expressed to Dr. Joyce Thomas and Ms. Jan Stocklinski who provided significant and invaluable support in scheduling interviews. A special note of thanks is also expressed to the superintendent, Dr. Murphy, members of his staff and others who reviewed and approved the project. Special thanks is also expressed to the ten principals who not only agreed to be interviewed but also extended to the interviewers professional courtesy and support during interviews in their schools.

The authors also acknowledge the assistance of students and other staff from the University of Maryland who assisted in conducting interviews.

Finally, to Mrs. Shirley Ryan much gratitude is expressed for the offering of her professional expertise and skill in painstakingly editing and typing this manuscript.

Process Documentation Report

Prince George's County

I. Introduction

A study to examine the implementation process of the School Development Program (SDP), also referred to in Prince George's County as the Comer Process, was conducted during the period April 17th to 30th, 1986. The basic purpose of the study was to gather information which would give the SDP staff at the Child Study Center (CSC), Yale University and the Prince George's Public School Central Administration and school level administration a comprehensive understanding of the functioning of the SDP (Comer Process) and people's perceptions of how it is working.

II. Study Design

The study design was a field survey utilizing a structured interview approach. A quota sampling technique was used to select participants.

III. Method

A. Sample:

A total of 51 individuals were interviewed. These included the following:

--Eleven Central Office Administrators: The Superintendent, 2 Associate Superintendents, 2 Assistant Superintendents, Special Assistant to the Superintendent for Magnet Schools, School Development Program (Comer Process) Coordinator, Director of Instruction, Supervisor of Guidance, Learning Disabiltiies Facilitator, Pupil Personnel Worker.

--The ten principals from the ten Milliken II Schools (schools in which the Comer Process is in effect).

--Ten parents, one each from the ten Milliken II schools. These were parents who were in some way involved with the Governance and Management Team (G&MT) at their respective schools.

--Ten teachers, one each from the ten Milliken II schools. These teachers were in some way involved with the Governance and Management Team (G&MT) at their respective schools.

--Ten guidance counselors, one each from the ten Milliken II schools. These guidance counselors were in some way involved with the Student, Staff, Services Team (SSST) at their respective schools.

B. Instrument

An interview protocol was developed by the SDP staff at the CSC. The major interview categories included the following:

1. SDP (Comer Process) History
2. Organizational Structure at Central Administration Level
3. SDP (Comer Process) Goals
4. Training in the SDP (Comer Process)
5. Dissemination of Information About SDP (Comer Process)
6. Implementation of the SDP (Comer Process) at the Individual School Level

C. Procedure:

The required permission to conduct interviews was obtained from the Superintendent's office through the Office of the Special Assistant to the Suerpintendent for Magnet Schools.

The CSC staff contracted with a research group at the University of Maryland to assist with interviews.

All 51 interviews were conducted over a period of 14 days.

Interviews with Central Office personnel were conducted at the central offfices of the Prince George's County Public Schools in Upper Marlboro. Interviews with school level staff and parents were conducted at the respective schools.

IV. Analysis

The analysis was conducted in two parts: (A) Macro Analysis/Description of the Model and (B) Micro analysis. The macro analysis examined and described the process reported by a consensus of the respondents according to the eight response categories contained in the interview protocols. The micro analysis examined differences in perception of how the model is working among those interviewed. It identified points of consensus and points of variability and suggested process areas which appear to be strongest or weakest.

V. Findings/Results

A. Macro

1. History:

The SDP (Comer Process) was introduced to the Prince George's School System in the Summer of 1985. Dr. James P. Comer, the originator of the model, visited the school system in July and met with the principals of the ten Milliken II schools during their retreat.

Prior to this July meeting, however, Dr. Comer had visited Prince George's County, met with Dr. Murphy, a group of principals and representatives of the Board of Education. Dr. Comer, during this meeting in the Spring of 1985, presented his ideas and concepts. Thus, as one interviewee noted, the wish to have the Comer Process in the Prince George's school system became visibly apparent in the spring but the first

concrete steps in its implementation occurred in July.

The SDP (Comer Process) was adopted largely in response to a court order which grew out of a desegregation court case. The ten Milliken II schools were extremely difficult to integrate using the traditional busing strategies because of their geographical isolation from other schools. The student populations of these schools were on the average greater than 90% black.

The court, based on a 1977 Detroit court decision, ruled that a percentage of schools could be left predominantly one-race schools providing that they were duly compensated with appropriate additional resources.

The superintendent is credited with identifying the SDP (Comer Process) as the instrument to be used in those schools which could not be integrated and which could not serve as magnet schools because of their geographical locations. The superintendent, after reading of the successes of the SDP (Comer Process) in New Haven, invited Dr. Comer to Prince George's County, thus establishing the working relationship which currently exists.

2. Organizational Structure (Relationship of SDP (Comer Process) to System)

The SDP (Comer Process)) in Prince George's County is directly overseen by an individual who holds the title of SDP (Comer Process) facilitator. She reports to the Special Assistant to the Superintendent for Magnet Schools who, in turn, reports to the Superintendent.

The SDP (Comer Process) facilitator assists the ten Milliken II schools in their implementation of the SDP (Comer Process). The

facilitator does not work exclusively with Milliken II schools. She has responsibility forother schools identified as magnet schools. Approximately 50 to 60 percent of her normal work time is devoted to the Milliken II schools.

3. Prince George's School System and SDP (Comer Process) Goals

The Prince George's school system in its revised mission statement established five improvement goals based on its revised mission statement. The mission statement as paraphrased by one interviewee states that:

> all students will learn the central curriculum so that they will be responsible, productive members of society, that this is best done in a climate where there are high expectations for students, positive instructional leadership, support from the home and community frequently monitoring the student achievement.

Five improvement goals stemming from the mission statement were indicated for the entire school system. They are as follows:

a. Yearly, there will be an increase in standardized test scores, particularly into the upper quartile.

b. More students will pass the required functional test that graduation requires.

c. There will be a closing of the gap between the achievement of black and white students and an increase overall for all students.

d. Annually, a larger percentage of students will obtain mastery of criteria and reference test objectives.

e. Attendance will improve across the school system annually.

The SDP (Comer Process) goals are seen to compliment those of the school system in general. The SDP (Comer Process) goals have been identified as basically three:

a. To improve/enhance school climate.

b. To increase parental involvement in school activities, management and decision making.

c. To improve academic achievement.

4. Training in the SDP (Comer Process)

The individual selected to serve as SDP (Comer Process) facilitator came to the CSC as a fellow for three weeks and two days to be trained and immersed in the model in early fall of 1985. She returned to the Prince George's school system to share what she had learned and to serve as the facilitator (change agent) in getting the SDP (Comer Process) established.

Following the return of the facilitator to Prince George's school system and her initial groundwork, three groups of individuals came to the CSC to be trained in the SDP (Comer Process) over a four day period. The first group came in early October, the second group early November and the third group in February. The groups included an Associate Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, Special Assistant to the Superintendent, Model Facilitator (came with each group), supervisors, pupil personnel worker, psychologist, ten principals from the Milliken II schools, guidance counselor, teacher and parent. Each group consisted of about 10 persons with at least one person representing the spectrum of persons involved in the life of the schools.

The training activities included the following:

a. Workshops with Dr. Comer at the Child Study Center:

During these workshops Dr. Comer discussed critical issues in child development. He explained the relationship between the social millieu (family, neighborhood, mores, peers, role models) and the child's school related behaviors. He also stressed the vital role of school personnel in seeking to understand each child as an individual with idiosyncratic needs.

Time was set aside for questions and answers and for group interaction following Dr. Comer's presentation.

b. School Visits:

Trainees were taken to a number of schools in the New Haven Public School System to experience the impact of the SDP (Comer Process) first hand. They held discussions with school principals, teachers, other professional staff, house staff and, in some instances, with students.

c. Visits to Central Office:

Trainees were taken to the central administrative offices of the New Haven Public Schools to meet with the Superintendent of Schools and members of his administrative staff. The purpose of these meetings was to give the trainees an opportunity to talk and interact with central office level administrators to hear and share their perspectives on the process.

d. Recreational/Social Activities:

For each group of trainees there was a social hour at the hotel on the night of their arrival to welcome them to New Haven and to introduce them to members of the SDP (Comer Process) staff at the CSC. For two of the three groups of trainees there was also a followup social

evening at the home of a member of the SDP (Comer Process) staff at the CSC.

Trainees were also taken on walking tours of Yale University and New Haven by the facilitator of the SDP (Comer Process) in the New Haven Public Schools who is on the staff of the CSC and by an assistant who is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Psychology at Yale University.

e. Staff meetings:

The SDP (Comer Process) facilitator was invited to join the SDP (Comer Process) staff at the CSC at their regular meetings during her initial preparatory visit. This provided her with an opportunity to observe the dynamics behind the key decisions which are made relative to the process.

5. Dissemination of Information about SDP (Comer Process)

Dissemination of information about the process has taken various forms. These include:

a. debriefings of trainees upon their return to Prince George's county in staff meetings at the central office level and in meetings at the school level, as well as during informal discussions with colleagues;

b. distribution of relevant materials on the SDP (Comer Process) by the facilitator;

c. inservice training activities for school system personnel;

d. lectures by Dr. Comer in Prince George's county.

6. Implementation of the SDP (Comer Process) at the School Level

The SDP (Comer Process) is currently in effect in ten schools identified as Milliken II schools and is being introudced to four more schools this fall, 1986.

The SDP (Comer Process) facilitator assists the schools in

establishing the various components of the model. She, in effect, helps to facilitate the transition to the new program through technical assistance, training and monitoring.

SDP Components

The school principal is expected to take the lead in organizing the respective basic components of the model. These components include:

(1) The Governance and Management Team (G&MT)

(2) The STudent Staff Services Team (SSST)

(3) The Social Curriculum

A key element of the model is parental involvement in decision making (G&MT) and participation in social curriculum activities.

G&MT

The G&MT consists of the principal, teachers, other professional and support staff and parents. The number of persons in each group varies from school to school. However, the total number of persons who serve on the G&MT averages about ten. The process by which teachers and other staff serve on the G&MT also varies from school to school. In some schools the members are elected, in others members volunteer.

The basic functions of the G&MT include:

(1) To establish a positive climate in the school. This is achieved through attention to interpersonal relationships, the development of a social calendar and setting guidelines which give direction and order.

(2) To set academic goals.

(3) To assess staff development needs and develop programs to address these needs.

SSST

The two basic functions of the SSST include:

(1) To discuss and address individual problems that may arise in the school.

(2) To discuss and devise strategies for pre-empting potential problems in the school.

The SSST generally meets as is necessary. This works out to be at least twice per month on the average.

Social Calendar

The social calendar is a schedule of social, cultural and educational events planned by the G&MT for the school year. The events are usually designed to involve the community in which a given school is located. For example, events in the Milliken II schools have included but have not been limited to the following:

--A father's breakfast at which over 125 fathers, stepfathers, uncles, brothers and grandfathers with primary responsibility of children were in attendance;

--An international week to which parents and the community at large were invited. Guest speakers from different embassies were invited and cultural events such as dances, food and artifacts were highlighted.

--A talent show during which students and staff performed together.

--Weekly coffee hour during which parents are invited to visit the school and chat informally with teachers over coffee and refreshments.

--Honor roll tea during which proud parents of children who make the school's honor role present their children with certificates of recognition.

The major purpose of the social calendar is to foster positive relationships between schools and their communities and to enhance these relationships over time.

B. Micro Analysis

The micro analysis is an analytic examination of the SDP (Comer Process) process. It highlights process issues that probably should be critically reviewed and, if necessary, addressed. A caveat must be stated at this point with respect to percentages in the tables which follow. Percentages based on a total N of less than 100 is considered to be generally less than meaningful. In all of the tables which follow the N's are less than 100. However, percentages are presented as a frame of reference. All tables are presented sequentially in the Appendix.

Central Office Level

All data are based on interviews with 11 central office level staff persons.

(a) Goals:

Respondents' perceptions of the goals of the SDP (Comer Process) included improvement in Academic Achievement, School Climate, Community Relations and Attitudes toward Children and Resource Development. Presented in Table 1 is a breakdown of perceptions.

(b) Progress:

Respondents were asked to indicate their perceptions of the progress being made toward the accomplishment of the goals. Their responses were

summarized in terms of No Progess, Some Progress, Much Progress. Presented in Table 2 is a summary of the responses.

Some comments in response to the question on progress include the following:

--"I really think the system has come a long way."

--"It's only been one year and I found that the changes we're thinking about making were deep. I have heard some parents say it's easier to come in to the school...I guess I would like to hear that with some more frequency...it's a good start."

--"I think it is at various levels in different schools. I think it depends on the leadership of the principal and I've seen some schools just take off and become very involved and understand what the objectives are. I've seen others a little hesitant to move. The spaghetti dinner I'm going to tonight is a good start."

--"Absolutely dramatic and remarkable---this year our standardized achievement scores indicated greater progress on the part of black students and white achievement did close additionally."

2. School Level

All data are based on interviews with 40 school level staff persons. The sample of 40 included 10 principals, 10 guidance counselors, 10 parents and 10 classroom teachers.

(a) Goals

Respondents' perceptions of the goals of the SDP (Comer Process) are summarized in Table 3.

The most frequently cited goal was community relations/parental involvement cited by 40% of the respondents. This was followed by

academic achievement (35%) and student behavior/psychosocial adjustment (30%). School climate was the fourth most frequently mentioned goal (28%).

(b) Respondents' perceptions of obstacles in getting the process started and whether or not these problems still exist are summarized in Table 4.

The most frequently cited obstacle in getting the process started was getting parents/community involved (23%). This problem is perceived to still exist by 10% of the respondents. The second most frequently cited obstacle was communication/information about the process (10%). This problem appears to no longer exist. One other problem which has been mentioned as continuing to exist is getting G&MT organized, cited by one respondent, 3% of the total sample of 40.

Other problems cited in the implementation of the model and not elicited by the question directly related to Table 4 include reported resistence on the part of at least one principal due to either an unwillingness to share decision making or a perception that the process is redundant and unnecessary. Another interviewee reported dissatisfaction with the management style of his/her principal.

(c) Principals' perceptions of their role in the implementation of the process are represented in the excerpts which follow from selected responses:

"...my role is to have the process working with as little emphasis on my role as possible. The more it can be self sufficent, the better off I feel it is..."

"...I serve as the instructional leader in the building...I perceive

myself as an instructional leader because I think that entails far more than administrative work..."

"I'm a supporter and I guess I'm kind of the supporter. I guess the overseer."

"The leader, but to head in the sense that getting the process working, not the leader of a group per se. But to lead in the sense to make sure the model moves..."

"...meeting with teachers, meeting with grade level people, meeting with parents and make sure that we are all hearing the same things and saying the same things that children are not confused."

"Facilatator; leader of the process itself. Disseminator of information."

"...my role is served in leading the G&MT Team, getting teachers to understand that we are a team, we work together, we want input from all parts of that team, maybe establishing the agenda, but not being like a dictator...but at times, you do have to pick up the leadership role."

(d) Teachers/Counselors/Staff perceptions of their role are represented in the excerpts which follow from selected responses:

---"I see myself as an advocate for the child...I do things like parent interviews when needed to get some background on the child we are discussing" (counselor, SST & G&MT member)

---"I see myself as an integral part of the whole staff...to go about making positive changes...I feel like I am being a more effective teacher" (teacher-not on G&MT).

---I work on the G&MT and the SST. I also work to address some of the

needs of children. I do evening counseling" (Counselor, SST & G&MT member).

"To improve academic standing of pupils...to improve relationships...to strive to make the child feel good about himself, not to ridicule the child...to try to get a good relationship with the parent...(Teacher, G&MT member).

"...my primary concern is kids' emotional well being here. Not only their academic area." (Counselor, G&MT member).

"My specific function that the county has given me is to coordinate the computer lab and see to it that the students work in the lab with computers and with computer software and that the material is integrated with the rest of the curriculum. I see my function as both helping students and teachers and serving resources to them" (Teacher, G&MT member).

"...I see my role moved closer to the parent involvement part. They usually call me for just listening and things like that" (Counselor, SST and G&MT member).

"...I contribute a lot in child development in helping parents and tachers to understand children...remind them of stages that kids go through" (Counselor, SST & G&MT member).

(e) Parents perception so their role are represented in the excerpts which follow from selected responses:

"I'm a member of the G&MT. I'm a member of the superintendent's committee 100 advisory team, of the county-wide supervisory team. It's the advisory team to the superintendent..." (G&MT member).

"...I've always been on the entertainment committees because that is

very close to what I do in real life. You know, along with suggesting, obviously, things to do as with the other parents. Just talking freely about problems that are going on and possible solutions."

"Getting the parents involved. If there is any literature run off or passed out then I try to handle that."

"I guess I'm more or less a liaison between the PTA and the school, the treasurer of the PTA. So a lot of times if that committee comes up with something or the G&MT something that the school needs, I might take the project back to the PTA and see if we could fund it" (G&MT member).

Representative parent, also vice president of the PTA (G&MT member).

(f) Special activities and events in schools perceived to be totally or largely attributable to the existence of the process and planned by the G&MT are listed below:

--Volleyball game between parents, teachers and other staff members.

--Honor role system where parents attended an honor day banquet and presented honor roll certificate.

--Christmas Eve holiday program

--Expansion of programs already in existence

--Parents filling jobs in the schools such as classroom aide or filing in the library.

--School tutoring between 2 and 4 PM, Monday through Thursday.

--Drop in breakfast for school staff and parents in the school. Parents are able to meet informally with teachers.

--Computer lab

--Rewards for outstanding performance including buttons, certificates and trips.

--Computer class for parents only

--Special feature added to Christmas program

--Family nights

--Fathers' breakfast

--International week

(g) Perceptions of how well the SDP (Comer Process) is functioning in terms of its overall contribution to improvement in school climate, student behavior, teacher morale and student achievement.

Among the interviewees who were uncertain or whose responses were unclear, some indicated that positive changes had occurred but could not be attributed solely or directly to the SDP (Comer Process). They expressed the view that other variables were responsible. This position was taken by a few (5 or 6) of the respondents.

(h) Training

Three groups of individuals visited the Child Study Center to meet with Dr. Comer to receive training in the SDP (Comer Process). These groups included central office level administrators, the ten principals of the Milliken II schools, teachers, counselors, psychologists and parents. The composition of the group appeared to be well stratified and representative.

A number of questions related to the training experience were asked of the trainees. The data generated by these questions are presented below:

1. Representativeness of selected trainees:

Question: Would you say that the individuals selected were representative of all levels of administrative and professional staff?

Table 6 shows that 17 (81%) of those who received training and whose responses were recorded and interpretable felt that the trainees were representative of all strata of school district personnel including school level staff.

Some important comments related to selection included the following:

--No, I don't know how they were selected...I can't say, I'd say in the end results we did a decent job. I would've liked to have seen more men counselors in the elementary school setting. You had more females, I think there is a need. I think youngsters need males to identify with. (No)

--Yes. Very nicely organized because we had people who were most immediately involved at first and make sure they would have an understanding of the model... Then the next step was to get more of the resource people... I think a good representative group was set up. (Yes)

--I think we needed more teachers. I think it would be helpful to take teachers. We only took two... We should have taken more parents... Otherwise I think it was a great cross-wise section. (Ambivalent)

(2) Perceived usefulness of training activities

Trainees were asked to indicate the usefulness of activities in which they were involved during training. The data generated by this question are presented in Table 7.

The total n for each activity listed in Table 7 varies due to the fact that some trainees either did not respond to an activity, their responses were too vague to be classified or they indicated not having been exposed to the activity.

The usefulness of each activity was rated on a 3 point scale (Not useful=1; Fairly useful=2; Very useful=3). The mean rating of each activity is given in the extreme left column. The data indicate that workshops at the Child Study Center were perceived to be the most useful (2.95), followed by talks with teachers (2.82). The least useful activity, but fairly useful nonetheless, was talking with principals (2.42).

(3) Fullfillment of Expectations During Training.

Trainees were asked whether or not their expectations were met.

Of the 21 trainee responses analyzed 12 (57%) indicated that their expectations were completely met, 4 (19%) indicated that their expectations were somewhat met and 5 (24%) indicated that their expectations were not met.

Some of the comments concerning the fulfillment of expectations include the following:

> --My expectation was that I would see the plan in action and see that it was what people were saying it was...I went there and I found out that that expectation was definitely met, that it was really taking place.
>
> --I was expecting we would be more involved in the schools and that was just a quirk. I certainly think that my expectations were met. It was a nice experience. I made a friend of somebody

I never met before in the county and I made a friend with one of the other counselors. We just love to see each other now and talk and share schools. It was a nice situation.

--My expectations were met. My expectations of the training were those that we put in our plan. I was very satisfied with that.

--I expected that I would see the process in action. And that I would have opportunities to interact with the staff at Yale. In retrospect the school visits were a little less helpful than I expected but the interaction with the staff at Yale was far more helpful than I expected.

--I would say that they were sort of squashed. We could have used more time at the Center itself and more time with people already involved and with the parents.

--My expectations were I would come to New Haven and spend almost everyday in schools. I would be going to lots and lots of meetings and lots of mental health training and lots of G&MT meetings. Those expectations were not met. My greatest expectations were met. My greatest un-expectations were met. I came back with what I went for but know I didn't get it the way I thought I would get it...I think there needed to be more involvement from the school system people.

V. Summary

This report presented as concisely as possible the essence of the results of the process documentation study concerning the implementation of the Comer Process in the Milliken II schools, Prince George's County, Maryland.

The first part of the report presented macro analysis of the model. It was essentially a description of the implementation process without critical review based on consensus from interview responses and on documents. The second part was a micro analysis which analyzed responses to interview items and presented individuals' perceptions of various aspects of the process.

Generally, the process was perceived as working well. It appeared to be achieving its goals to some extent. Some dubiousness was expressed as to whether the process itself was bringing about the noted positive changes, whether it was interacting with other variables to produce change or whether it was having any effect at all. Most respondents agreed that without the process the noted positive changes probably would not be occuring.

The strongest effect of the process in schools seemed to be on teacher morale followed by school climate. Student behavior and achievement are seen to have been positively affected as well, but to a lesser extent.

APPENDIX

Table 1
Perceived Goals of the SDP (Comer Process): Central Office Staff

Goal	Frequency	%
Academic Achievement	9	82
School Climate	3	27
Community Relations/Parental Involvement	5	45
Attitudes/Better Understanding of Children	4	36
Resource Development	1	9

Frequencies and percentages are based on N=11

Table 2
Preceived Progress Toward Accomplishing Goals

Progress Status	Frequency	%
No Progress	0	0
Some Progress	5	45
Much Progress	6	55

Frequencies and percentages are based on N=11

Table 3
Perceived Goals of SDP (Comer Process): School Level Staff

Goal	Frequency	%
Academic Achievement	14	35
School Climate	11	28
Community Relations/Parental Involvement	16	40
Teacher Attitudes/Better Understanding of Children	5	13
Resource Development	1	3
Student Behavior/Psychosocial Adjustment	12	30
Staff Development	3	8
Change People's Thinking About Education	1	3
Quality of Education	4	10
Desegregation	1	3
Curriculum Development/Diversified Experiences	1	3

Frequencies and percentages are based on N=40

Table 4

Perceived Obstacles

Obstacles	Frequency	%	Still a Problem	%
Anxiety About Something New on Part of Teachers	2	5	0	0
Anxiety About Something New on Part of Parents	1	3	0	0
Getting Parents/Community Involved	9	23	4	10
Coordinating Times for Parents and Teachers to Meet	3	8	0	0
Communication/Satisfactory Information About Process	4	10	0	0
School/Community Relations	2	5	0	0
Getting G&MT Organized	1	3	1	3
Timing/The Time Program Started	1	3	0	0
Availability of Time for Meetings	1	3	0	0
Planning Small Details	1	3	0	0
Decisions About How to Utilize New Resources/Personnel	1	3	0	0
Teacher Willingness to Participate/ Teacher Requests for Transfer	1	3	0	0

Frequencies and percentages are based on an N=40

Table 5
Perceived Effects of SDP (Comer Process)

Mean Effect Rating	Progress Indicators	Negative 0		No Effect 1		Some Effect 2		Much Effect 3		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2.21	School Climate			7	21	13	38	14	41	34	100
2.07	Student Behavior			6	20	16	53	8	27	30	100
2.30	Teacher Morale	2	7	31	10	9	30	16	53	30	100
1.88	Student Achievement			6	24	16	64	3	12	25	100

The total N for each progress indicator is based on the number of clearly stated and interpretable responses to that item.

Table 6
Perception of Representativeness of Trainees

Representativeness	Frequency	%
Yes	17	81
No	2	9.5
Ambivalent	2	9.5
Total	21	100

Table 7

Perceived Usefulness of Training Activities

Mean Rating	Activity	Not Useful 1		Fairly Useful 2		Very Useful 3		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2.95	Workshops at the CSC			1	5	21	95	22	100
2.56	Talking with parents	1	6	5	31	10	63	16	100
2.50	School Visits			8	50	8	50	16	100
2.42	Talking with principals			9	47.5	9	47.5	19	100
2.82	Talking with Teachers			3	18	14	82	17	100
2.50	Talking with Other School Staff			6	50	6	50	12	100
2.50	Talking with Central Office Level Staff	1	6	6	38	9	56	16	100
2.56	Observing Classroom Activity	1	6	6	33	11	61	18	100

Table 8
Perceived Fulfillment of Expectations During Training

	N	%
Expectations Completely Met	12	57
Expectations Somewhat Met	4	19
Expectations Not Met	5	24
Total	21	100